

Labor Department has put this change in retroactively and thus we have to do that as well in order to deal with the problem. Again, the point we are trying to do is to go to a status quo situation. We are trying to stop the change because the change is unfair and that is all that this amendment does, and that is why the Vickers amendment to it is unreasonable.

SPEAKER NICHOL: As far as I know, no one else wishes to speak to the amendment to the amendment, right? Senator Vickers, did you wish to close on your amendment to the amendment?

SENATOR VICKERS: Yes, Mr. President, very briefly. First of all I don't think this is unfair at all. Senator DeCamp and Senator Wesely both indicated that we are creating something that is very unfair here by making somebody pay something that they are not being asked to pay now, and that is not true. All we are doing if we pass the amendment that they are offering without the word changes that I am suggesting, is that we are excusing a company from paying a bill that up until now is a legitimate bill. Now I don't think that is anything unreasonable at all. It would be like me coming in here with an amendment that would say that I don't have to pay the feed bill that I ran up last month because I want to change the law to say that I didn't have to pay that bill. The fact of the matter is the Department of Labor has indicated to this company that, as I understand it, that they are liable for unemployment compensation, and the company has refused to pay. Now that is unfortunate. If they haven't paid it, then they are going to have to pay it in the future. They are going to have to pay their bill, but instead they come to us and they say, why don't you change the law and make it so that we don't have to pay our bill? All I am simply saying is if it is the body's wish to change that law so that unemployment doesn't apply to these people, and quite frankly I think it should, I will admit that, but if it doesn't, then we are going to say to this company, okay, you don't have to pay that bill that we assessed to you for the last month or two months or three months, or a year or whatever it was since we felt that you were under the law and had to pay it. Now as I indicated earlier, I just think it is wrong for us to pass legislation with these types of retroactive actions in them that wind up benefiting a certain particular party, and the amendment that Senator Sieck offered yesterday to a bill was designed...the bill as it originally was drafted was designed to do exactly that, and this bill is designed to do exactly that. It is designed to excuse a company from paying a bill that is justly due